arXiv:1510.07983v1 [math.NT] 27 Oct 2015

UPPER BOUNDS FOR DOUBLE EXPONENTIAL SUMS ALONG A SUBSEQUENCE

CHRISTOPHER J. WHITE

Abstract. We consider a class of double exponential sums studied in a paper of Sinai and Ulcigrai. They proved a linear bound for these sums along the sequence of denominators in the continued fraction expansion of α, provided α is badly-approximable. We provide a proof of a result, which includes a simple proof of their theorem, and which applies for all irrational α.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Some Notation.** Let $\alpha = [a_0; a_1, \ldots]$ denote the continued fraction expansion of $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$. We write $||x||$ for the distance from x to the nearest integer. The *convergents* $p_n/q_n = [a_0; a_1, \ldots, a_n]$, where $(p_n, q_n) = 1$, give good approximations to α. We call $\{q_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ the *sequence of denominators* of α. We say that an irrational number α is *badly-approximable* if there exists $\varepsilon_\alpha > 0$ such that for all $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(p, q) = 1$, we have

$$\left|\alpha - \frac{p}{q}\right| > \frac{\varepsilon_\alpha}{q^2}. \tag{1.1.1}$$

These correspond precisely with those numbers α for which there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_n(\alpha) \leq N$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The set of all badly-approximable numbers is a set of Lebesgue measure zero.
When α is badly approximable, we have the helpful bound that

$$||q_n\alpha|| > \frac{\varepsilon_\alpha}{q_n} \tag{1.1.2}$$

and since convergents give the best approximations for the distance to the nearest integer (see [6]), this means that for $m \leq q_{n+1} - 1$ we have the bound

$$||m\alpha|| > \frac{\varepsilon_\alpha}{q_n}. \tag{1.1.3}$$

We write $f(n) = O(g(n))$ to mean that there exists a constant C (which doesn't depend on n), such that $f(n) \leq C \cdot g(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
Finally we define the discrepancy of a sequence.

Definition 1.1. Let (x_n) be a sequence of real numbers. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ the *discrepancy* of (x_n) modulo one, $D_N(x_n)$, is defined as:

$$D_N(\{x_m\}) := \sup_{I \subseteq \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \left| \sum_{m=1}^{N} \chi_I(x_m) - N \cdot |I| \right| \tag{1.1.4}$$

where I denotes an interval and χ_I is the characteristic function of I.

1.2. **Double Exponential Sums.** In [8] Sinai & Ulcgrai studied double trigonometric sums of the form

$$T_M(\alpha) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} e(nm\alpha). \tag{1.2.1}$$

We want to determine when the absolute value of this sum is bounded uniformly (i.e. by a constant which depends only on α) over some subsequence $M \in \mathscr{A} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$. This will obviously depend on the Diophantine properties of α and the subsequence $\mathscr{A}$.
We will see that the problem of bounding this sum depends importantly on controlling sums such as

$$\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{1}{\{\{m\alpha\}\}} \right|. \tag{1.2.2}$$

Here

$$\{\{x\}\} := \begin{cases} \{x\}, & x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}], \\ \{x\} - 1, & x \in (-\frac{1}{2}, 0), \end{cases} \tag{1.2.3}$$

is the *signed fractional part* of $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

In [8] the following is proved

Theorem 1.2 (Sinai, Ulcigrai)**.** *Let α be badly-approximable. Consider the following double trigonometric sum:*

$$T_M(\alpha) := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} e(nm\alpha). \tag{1.2.4}$$

Then there exists a constant $C = C(\alpha) > 0$ such that $|T_M| \leq C_\alpha$ for all $M \in \{q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Our main theorem generalises this.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(\alpha) > 0$ such that*

$$|T_{q_n}| \leq C_\alpha \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{\log(2 \cdot \max_{i \leq n}\{a_i\})}{a_{n+1}}, 1 \right\}. \tag{1.2.5}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Remark 1.4. By examining signs it appears that the upper bound here is close to best possible. Equation (1.13) in [1] gives a lower bound for the largest terms in a sum that we will consider. While it's true that we use an inequality earlier in the calculation, it isn't too restrictive.

2. Proof of main result

2.1. **Reducing T_M.** Following the methods in [8] we split T_M into two separate sums.
By summing the terms for $n = 0, \ldots, M-1$ we can rewrite (1.2.1) as

$$T_M = 1 + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \frac{e(Mm\alpha) - 1}{e(m\alpha) - 1}. \tag{2.1.1}$$

Then we can write $T_M = 1 + S'_M - S''_M$ where

$$S'_M := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \frac{e(Mm\alpha)}{e(m\alpha) - 1} \text{ and} \tag{2.1.2}$$

$$S''_M := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \frac{1}{e(m\alpha) - 1}. \tag{2.1.3}$$

We will prove that there exist constants $C', C'' \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$|S'_{q_n}| \leq C' \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{\log(2 \cdot \max_{i \leq n}\{a_i\})}{a_{n+1}}, 1 \right\} \tag{2.1.4}$$

and

$$|S''_{q_n}| \leq C'', \tag{2.1.5}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. These constants will depend only on α.

2.2. **The Sum S''_M (2.1.3).** Let's consider the 'less intimidating' sum first. We want to show that there exists C'' such that $|S''_{q_n}| \leq C''$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
Note that in [2], Hardy and Littlewood prove a similar theorem.

Theorem 2.1 (Hardy, Littlewood)**.** *Let α be badly-approximable. Then there exists $C^* > 0$ such that $|S''_M| \leq C^*$ for each $M \in \mathbb{N}^+$.*

We proceed by calculating real and imaginary parts.

$$\frac{1}{e(m\alpha) - 1} = -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{i}{2} \cot(\pi m \alpha). \tag{2.2.1}$$

The Taylor series expansion of $\cot x$ is

$$\cot x = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n 4^n B_{2n}}{(2n)!} x^{2n-1} = \frac{1}{x} - \frac{x}{3} + \frac{x^3}{45} - \dots \tag{2.2.2}$$

with radius of convergence $0 < |x| < \pi$. Here B_n is the nth *Bernoulli number*.
Note that due to the symmetry of $\cot x$,

$$\cot(\pi m\alpha) = \cot(\pi\{\{m\alpha\}\}). \tag{2.2.3}$$

So we can write

$$\cot(\pi m\alpha) = \frac{1}{\pi\{\{m\alpha\}\}} \left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n 4^n B_{2n}}{(2n)!} (\pi\{\{m\alpha\}\})^{2n} \right) \tag{2.2.4}$$

Now the series on the right is negative and it takes values strictly between 0 (when $\{\{m\alpha\}\}$ is close to 0) and -1 (when $\{\{m\alpha\}\}$ is close to $\pm\frac{1}{2}$).
Hence in order to prove that $|S''_{q_n}|$ is bounded by a uniform constant for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have to prove the following

Lemma 2.2. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there exists $C = C(\alpha) > 0$ such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left| \sum_{m=1}^{q_n - 1} \frac{1}{q_n \{\{m\alpha\}\}} \right| \leq C. \tag{2.2.5}$$

We will consider two different proofs of Lemma 2.2. The first is simpler, while the the latter will be applicable to S'_M as well. The second proof is also malleable to proving Theorem 2.1.

2.3. **Koksma-Hlawka Proof of Lemma 2.2.** Recall the Koksma-Hlawka inequality.

Lemma 2.3. Let f be a function with period 1 of bounded variation. Then for every sequence x_m and every integer $N \geq 1$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{m=1}^{N} f(x_m) - \int_0^1 f(x)dx \right| \leq V(f) \frac{D_N(x_m)}{N},$$

where $V(f)$ is the total variation of the function.

We wish to apply this inequality with $f(x) = \frac{1}{\{\{x\}\}}$, $x_m = \{m\alpha\}$ and $N = q_n - 1$.

Therefore we have to restrict the domain on which we define our function, in order to ensure that it's integrable.
We're able to use the following from [7].

$$\left|\alpha - \frac{p_{n-1}}{q_{n-1}}\right| > \frac{1}{2q_{n-1}q_n}. \tag{2.3.1}$$

So for all $m \leq N = q_n - 1$, we have

$$||m\alpha|| > \frac{1}{2q_n}. \tag{2.3.2}$$

Hence we can restrict the domain of f to the interval $[\frac{1}{2q_n}, 1 - \frac{1}{2q_n}]$. Since f is anti-symmetric about $1/2$, the integral above is equal to 0. The total variation, $V(f)$, of f is

$$\sup_p \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \left| \frac{1}{\{\{x_{i+1}\}\}} - \frac{1}{\{\{x_i\}\}} \right|,$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ is a partition of $[\frac{1}{2q_n}, 1 - \frac{1}{2q_n}]$. It is maximised when we take the trivial partition (that is the two endpoints). Therefore $V(f) = 4q_n$.
Finally we move on to considering the Discrepancy.
Lemma 5.6 from [4] states that

$$D_N(m\alpha) \leq 3 \sum_{j=0}^{r} t_j, \tag{2.3.3}$$

where $N = \sum_{j=0}^{r} q_r t_j$. So if $N = q_n$ then $t_n = 1$ and $t_i = 0$ for all $i \neq n$. So $D_{q_n}(m\alpha) \leq 3$.
Finally can apply all the estimates we have (with $N = q_n - 1$ and f & $\{x_m\}$ as above).

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{m=1}^{q_n-1} f(x_m) - (q_n - 1) \int_0^1 f(x)dx \right| &\leq D_{q_n-1}(x_m)V(f) && (2.3.4) \\ &\leq (D_{q_n}(x_m) + 1)V(f) && (2.3.5) \\ &\leq 4 \cdot 4q_n = 16q_n && (2.3.6) \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\left| \frac{1}{q_n} \sum_{m=1}^{q_n-1} \frac{1}{\{\{m\alpha\}\}} \right| \leq 16. \tag{2.3.7}$$

Here we used the obvious fact that $D_M(x_m) \leq D_{M+1}(x_m) + 1$.

2.4. **The sum $S_M^{'}$ (2.1.2).** We move on to considering the sum

$$S'_M := \frac{1}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{M-1}\frac{e(Mm\alpha)}{e(m\alpha)-1}, \tag{2.4.1}$$

We will write this sum as a telescoping series and take advantage of some cancellation to reduce our situation to considering the sum $S_M^{''}$ (2.1.3).

We write

$$\sum_{m=1}^{M-1}\frac{e(Mm\alpha)}{e(m\alpha)-1} = \sum_{m=1}^{M-1}(e(Mm\alpha)-e(M(m+1)\alpha))\sum_{k=1}^{m}\frac{1}{e(k\alpha)-1} \tag{2.4.2}$$

$$+ e(M^2\alpha)\sum_{k=1}^{M-1}\frac{1}{e(k\alpha)-1}. \tag{2.4.3}$$

We write $\alpha = \frac{p_n}{q_n} + \frac{\xi_n}{q_n q_{n+1}}$ where $\frac{1}{2} < |\xi_n| < 1$. We then consider the outer part of the sum on the right hand side of (2.4.2) (for $M = q_n$)

$$e(mq_n\alpha) - e((m+1)q_n\alpha) = e(mq_n\psi_n) - e((m+1)q_n\psi_n) \tag{2.4.4}$$

$$= e(mq_n\psi_n) - e(mq_n\psi_n)e(q_n\psi_n) \tag{2.4.5}$$

$$= (1-e(q_n\psi_n))e(mq_n\psi_n), \tag{2.4.6}$$

which in absolute value is less than $2\pi/q_{n+1}$.
Now using the triangle inequality and Lemma 2.2 we see that (2.1.4) results from the following lemma

Lemma 2.4. $\forall m \leq q_n - 1$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m}\frac{1}{\{\{k\alpha\}\}} = O(q_n \max_{i\leq n}\{1, \log a_i\}). \tag{2.4.7}$$

To prove this Lemma we will need to introduce some different techniques, which will also yield a new proof of Lemma 2.2.

2.5. **Ostrowski Proof of Lemmas 2.2 & 2.4.** Our alternative proof of Lemma 2.2 will be to decompose the sum in (2.2.5) into segments where there is some obvious cancellation.

Definition 2.5. Let α be irrational, then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a unique integer $M \geq 0$ and a unique sequence $\{c_{k+1}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ of integers

such that $q_M \leq m < q_{M+1}$ and

$$m = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_{k+1} q_k, \tag{2.5.1}$$

with

$$0 \leq c_1 < a_1,\ 0 \leq c_{k+1} \leq a_{k+1} \text{ for } k \geq 1, \tag{2.5.2}$$

$$c_k = 0 \text{ whenever } c_{k+1} = a_{k+1} \text{ for some } k \geq 1, \tag{2.5.3}$$

and

$$c_{k+1} = 0 \text{ for } k > M. \tag{2.5.4}$$

This is known as the *Ostrowski expansion.*

We will consider segments of our sum which 'spread out' in the unit interval. We take our inspiration from a set of intervals discussed in [5].

Definition 2.6 (Special Intervals)**.** Define $A(m, c)$ to be the collection of non-negative integers n with Ostrowski expansions of the form

$$n = cq_{m-1} + \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} c_{k+1} q_k \tag{2.5.5}$$

and define a set $J(m, c)$ (which turns out be be an interval, see [5]) in $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ by

$$J(m, c) = \overline{\{n\alpha : n \in A(m, c)\}} \tag{2.5.6}$$

For any fixed m, these intervals cover $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and have some very nice properties such as the discrepancy of $\{n\alpha\}$ being bounded. We will use what these intervals tell us about the distribution of $n\alpha$ on the unit interval to achieve cancellation in (1.2.2).

Let $m \leq q_n - 1$,

$$m = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_{i+1} q_i, \quad 0 \leq c_{i+1} \leq a_{i+1} \tag{2.5.7}$$

and

$$n(i, c) := \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} c_{j+1} q_j + c q_i. \tag{2.5.8}$$

We will use this decomposition to sum up to m.

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{1}{\{\{k\alpha\}\}} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{c=0}^{c_{i+1}-1} \sum_{l=n(i,c)+1}^{n(i,c)+q_i} \frac{1}{\{\{l\alpha\}\}} \tag{2.5.9}$$

Note that $n(i,c)+q_i = n(i,c+1)$ and $n(i,c_{i+1}-1)+q_i = n(i+1,0)$. Let's consider a situation where we are studying

$$\sum_{l=n(i,c)+1}^{n(i,c)+q_i} \frac{1}{\{\{l\alpha\}\}}. \tag{2.5.10}$$

We wish to approximate α by p_i/q_i and achieve (almost) complete cancellation in the main term that we get.
Obviously problems can occur. Specifically, if $l \cdot p_i \equiv 0(q_i)$ then we don't want to divide by 0, so we want to isolate these terms and deal with them separately. Note that since $(p_i, q_i) = 1$, we have a complete set of residue classes modulo q_i, so in each sum, (2.5.10), we will have exactly one term, $(c+1)q_i$, where this happens .
Also, there exists $r \leq q_i$ such that

$$n(i,0)+r = q_i \tag{2.5.11}$$
$$n(i,1)+r = 2q_i \tag{2.5.12}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$n(i,c_{i+1}-1)+r = c_{i+1}q_i \tag{2.5.13}$$

So we can consider all these terms separately.

Finally we consider summing over a complete set of residue classes modulo q_i. We will first consider the simple case, $(1 \leq k \leq q_{i-1})$, which will give us a second proof of Lemma 2.2.
We write

$$\alpha = \frac{p_i}{q_i} + \frac{\xi_i}{q_i q_{i+1}}, \tag{2.5.14}$$

where $\frac{1}{2} < |\xi_i| < 1$. Now

$$\sum_{k=1}^{q_i-1} \frac{1}{\{\{k\alpha\}\}} = \sum_{k=1}^{q_i-1} \frac{1}{\{\{k\frac{p_i}{q_i} + \frac{k\xi_i}{q_i q_{i+1}}\}\}}. \tag{2.5.15}$$

Now we use the fact that

$$\left\{\left\{\frac{kp_i}{q_i} + \frac{k\xi_i}{q_i q_{i+1}}\right\}\right\} = \left\{\left\{\frac{kp_i}{q_i}\right\}\right\} + \left\{\left\{\frac{k\xi_i}{q_i q_{i+1}}\right\}\right\}, \tag{2.5.16}$$

unless perhaps if $kp_i \equiv \frac{q_i}{2}$ modulo q_i (when $2|q_i$), or if $kp_i \equiv \frac{q_i \pm 1}{2}$ (when $2|q_i+1$). Now (2.5.15) equals[1]

$$\sum_{k=1}^{q_{i-1}}{}' \frac{1}{\{\{k\frac{p_i}{q_i}\}\}} \left(\frac{1}{1+\{\{\frac{kp_i}{q_i}\}\}^{-1}\frac{k\xi_i}{q_iq_{i+1}}} \right) + O(1). \tag{2.5.17}$$

Furthermore

$$\left(\frac{1}{1+\{\{\frac{kp_i}{q_i}\}\}^{-1}\frac{k\xi_i}{q_iq_{i+1}}} \right) \tag{2.5.18}$$

$$= 1 - \left\{\left\{\frac{kp_i}{q_i}\right\}\right\}^{-1} \frac{k\xi_i}{q_iq_{i+1}} + \left\{\left\{\frac{kp_i}{q_i}\right\}\right\}^{-2} \left(\frac{k\xi_i}{q_iq_{i+1}}\right)^2 - \dots \tag{2.5.19}$$

There exists n_k such that $1 \le n_k \le q_i - 1$ and $n_k \equiv kp_i \mod q_i$. Now we define $n_k^{'}$ as follows

$$n_k^{'} := \begin{cases} n_k, & n_k \le \frac{q_i}{2} \\ n_k - q_i, & n_k > \frac{q_i}{2}. \end{cases} \tag{2.5.20}$$

Then

$$\left\{\left\{\frac{kp_i}{q_i}\right\}\right\}^{-1} \frac{k\xi_i}{q_iq_{i+1}} = \frac{k\xi_i}{n_k^{'}q_{i+1}}. \tag{2.5.21}$$

We then know that for all k,

$$-\left\{\left\{\frac{kp_i}{q_i}\right\}\right\}^{-1} \frac{k\xi_i}{q_iq_{i+1}} + \left\{\left\{\frac{kp_i}{q_i}\right\}\right\}^{-2} \left(\frac{k\xi_i}{q_iq_{i+1}}\right)^2 - \dots \tag{2.5.22}$$

$$= C_k \frac{k\xi_i}{n_k^{'}q_{i+1}}. \tag{2.5.23}$$

We need $|n_k^{'}| \ge 2$ in order to have a uniform bound over k for the constant C_k. When this is the case

$$-\frac{1}{2} < C_k < 2, \tag{2.5.24}$$

(apart from the one or two exceptions mentioned previously). So we have to isolate another two terms. We write k_1, k_{-1} for the numbers where $k_1p_i \equiv 1 \mod q_i$ and $k_{-1}p_i \equiv -1 \mod q_i$ respectively.
So (2.5.15) becomes

$$\sum_{n_k=2}^{q_i-2} \left(\frac{1}{\{\{\frac{n_k}{q_l}\}\}} + C_k \left(\frac{k\xi_i q_i}{(n_k^{'})^2 q_{i+1}} \right) \right) + \frac{1}{\{\{k_1\alpha\}\}} + \frac{1}{\{\{k_{-1}\alpha\}\}} + O(1) \tag{2.5.25}$$

[1]The one or two extra term/s mentioned just above have been removed from the sum and are accounted for by the $O(1)$ term.

$$= \sum_{n_k=2}^{q_i-2} C_k \left(\frac{k\xi_i q_i}{(n_k^{'})^2 q_{i+1}} \right) + O(q_i). \tag{2.5.26}$$

(We used the basic approximation from Khinchin (2.3.1) to deal with the two extra terms.)
By the rearrangement inequality (see [3], Theorem 368) this first sum is less than

$$q_i \left(\frac{1}{2^2} + \frac{1}{3^2} + \dots \right), \tag{2.5.27}$$

which in turn is bounded above by q_i.
So

$$\sum_{k=1}^{q_i-1} \frac{1}{\{\{k\alpha\}\}} = O(q_i), \tag{2.5.28}$$

as required.
Now we move on to a proof of Lemma 2.4. We wish to prove (for all i) that

$$\sum_{c=0}^{c_{i+1}-1} \sum_{l=n(i,c)+1}^{n(i,c)+q_i} \frac{1}{\{\{l\alpha\}\}} = O(q_{i+1} \log c_{i+1}). \tag{2.5.29}$$

Note that if we sum

$$\sum_{l=n(i,c)+1}^{n(i,c)+q_i} \frac{1}{\{\{l\alpha\}\}} \tag{2.5.30}$$

then a similar argument to the proof of Lemma 2.2 shows that this is equal to

$$O(q_i) + \frac{1}{\{\{k_{(1,c)}\alpha\}\}} + \frac{1}{\{\{k_{(-1,c)}\alpha\}\}} + \frac{1}{\{\{(c+1)q_i\alpha\}\}}, \tag{2.5.31}$$

where $n(i,c)+1 \leq k_{(\pm 1,c)} \leq n(i,c)+q_i$, and $k_{(\pm 1,c)} p_i \equiv \pm 1 \mod q_i$.
Clearly $k_{(\pm 1,c)} = k_{(\pm 1,0)} + cq_i$.
Furthermore as $m < q_{i+1}$,

$$k_{(\pm 1, c_{i+1}-r)} < n(i,(c_{i+1}-r)) + q_i < q_{i+1} - (r-1)q_i. \tag{2.5.32}$$

Now, we calculated earlier that

$$\frac{1}{\{\{k\alpha\}\}} = \frac{1}{\{\{k\frac{p_i}{q_i}\}\}} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \{\{\frac{kp_i}{q_i}\}\}^{-1} \frac{k\xi_i}{q_i q_{i+1}}} \right) \tag{2.5.33}$$

Letting $k = k_{(1,0)}$

$$\frac{1}{\{\{k_{(1,0)}\alpha\}\}} = q_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + \frac{k_{(1,0)}\xi_i}{q_{i+1}}} \right) \tag{2.5.34}$$

$$= \frac{q_i q_{i+1}}{q_{i+1} + k_{(1,0)}\xi_i}. \tag{2.5.35}$$

Hence

$$\frac{1}{\{\{k_{(1,c)}\alpha\}\}} = \frac{q_i q_{i+1}}{q_{i+1} + (k_{(1,0)} + cq_i)\xi_i} \tag{2.5.36}$$

and also

$$\frac{1}{\{\{k_{(-1,c)}\alpha\}\}} = \frac{-q_i q_{i+1}}{q_{i+1} - (k_{(-1,0)} + cq_i)\xi_i} \tag{2.5.37}$$

Now, without loss of generality, assume that $\xi_i > 0$. Then

$$\frac{1}{\{\{k_{(1,c)}\alpha\}\}} < q_i \tag{2.5.38}$$

for all c. Hence

$$\sum_{c=0}^{c_{i+1}-1} \sum_{l=n(i,c)+1}^{n(i,c)+q_i} \frac{1}{\{\{l\alpha\}\}} = O(q_{i+1}) + \sum_{c=0}^{c_{i+1}-1} \frac{1}{\{\{(c+1)q_i\alpha\}\}} \tag{2.5.39}$$

$$+ \sum_{c=0}^{c_{i+1}-1} \frac{-q_i q_{i+1}}{q_{i+1} - (k_{(-1,0)} + cq_i)\xi_i} \tag{2.5.40}$$

$$= O(q_{i+1}) + O(q_{i+1} \log c_{i+1}) \tag{2.5.41}$$

$$+ \sum_{c=0}^{c_{i+1}-1} \frac{-q_i q_{i+1}}{q_{i+1} - (k_{(-1,0)} + cq_i)\xi_i}. \tag{2.5.42}$$

Finally

$$\left| \sum_{c=0}^{c_{i+1}-1} \frac{-q_i q_{i+1}}{q_{i+1} - (k_{(-1,0)} + cq_i)\xi_i} \right| \leq \frac{q_i}{c_{i+1} - 1} + \ldots + \frac{q_i}{2} + q_i + 2q_{i+1} \tag{2.5.43}$$

$$= O(q_{i+1} \log c_{i+1}). \tag{2.5.44}$$

As this is true for all i, the condition for Lemma 2.4 follows.

Remark 2.7. Equation (1.13) in [1] tells us that the sum

$$\sum_{c=0}^{c_{i+1}-1} \frac{1}{\{\{(c+1)q_i\alpha\}\}} \tag{2.5.45}$$

can be no smaller than $O(q_{i+1} \log c_{i+1})$.

Remark 2.8. In our final calculation we have ignored the cancellation between the positive and negative terms. However, when $c_{i+1} \approx a_{i+1}/2$ for example, we get very little cancellation and our main term is $O(q_{i+1} \log a_{i+1})$

References

[1] V. Beresnevich & A. Haynes & S. Velani : *Sums of reciprocals of* $(n\alpha - \gamma)$ *modulo 1 and multiplicative Diophantine approximation*, Preprint.

[2] G.H Hardy & J.E. Littlewood: *Some problems of Diophantine approximation: a series of cosecants*, Bull. Calcutta Math. Soc. Vol. 20, 1930, 251-266.

[3] G.H Hardy & J.E. Littlewood & G. Pólya: *Inequalities*, Cambridge Mathematical Library (2. ed.), Cambridge University Press (1952).

[4] G. Harman: *Metric Number Theory*, Oxford University Press (1998).

[5] A. Haynes: *Equivalence classes of codimension one cut-and-project sets*, Ergodic Theory Dyn. Syst., to appear.

[6] A. Khinchin: *Continued Fractions*, The University of Chicago Press (1964).

[7] A. Rockett & P. Szüsz: *Continued Fractions*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd. (1992).

[8] Ya. Sinai & C. Ulcgrai: *Estimates from above of certain double trigonometric sums*, Journal of Fixed Point Theory and Applications. Vol. 6, no. 1, 2009, 93 - 113.

School of Mathematics, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

E-mail address: chris.white@bristol.ac.uk